Common Council
Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Committee
16 June 2010
6:00 pm
Hooker Room (#245)
401 N. Morton

MEMORANDUM

***In attendance*:**
Committee: Mike Satterfield (Chair), Tim Mayer, Susan Sandberg and Isabel Piedmont-Smith
Absent: Hans Huffman and Dr. Anthony Pizzo and Andy Ruff
Housing & Neighborhood Development: Marilyn Patterson and Lisa Abbott
Council Office: Dan Sherman and Stacy Jane Rhoads

I. PROLOGUE

Chair Satterfield opened the meeting and stated that the focus of this meeting is to wrap up the 2010 Jack Hopkins Social Services Funding Program (JHSSF), reviewing what worked well and what warrants improvement.

II. REVIEW OF THE 2010 PROCESS

Sherman reviewed the following components of the 2010 Program: Solicitations; Technical Assistance; Application Package; First Review of Applications; Presentations; Rankings; Pre-Allocation Meeting and Allocation Meeting.

Sherman asked for any feedback on the process.

- Sandberg stated that this is the fourth year she has served on the Committee. Each year brings its own challenges. She said that she is thankful that the Committee has more money to allocate to social services each year.

- Mayer said that Julio Alonso of the Hoosier Hills Foodbank told Mayer that the Hopkins criteria do not make clear that the Committee will not fund county-based projects. This prohibition either needs to be made clear in the criteria or re-visited by the Committee before it sends out its 2011 solicitations.

- Satterfield offered that he thought the process moved pretty smoothly this year.

- Piedmont-Smith agreed that the process went well this year, but pointed out that Ruff has concerns with funding the Hospital and MCCSC Foundation. She further pointed out that giving the school foundation money was new this year.

- Sandberg pointed out that one of the guiding principles of the Hopkins fund is to be responsive to changing community circumstances. The loss of funding by the schools was a special circumstance. That the Committee was able to meet this need underscores its responsiveness.

- Mayer mentioned that when it comes to individual Committee member ranking, there is oftentimes a disconnect between a numeric ranking and the recommended allocation – one does not always necessarily follow from the other. He stated that CDBG physical improvement program has dispensed with numeric rankings; Committee members only make allocation recommendations.

- Piedmont-Smith added that when the Committee makes partial funding recommendations, it does not always think through exactly what such partial funding means for agencies – e.g., what does partial funding translate into re: number of cots, hours to devoted to a program, etc.

- Sandberg pointed out that agencies do spell out priorities for partial funding in their applications.

- Satterfield observed that as the Hopkins fund increases, so too might the number of applications received. It may ultimately take the Committee more and more time to thoughtfully review all the applications. The Committee might have to add another meeting to its process.

- Abbott relayed that the Mayor will be committing $20,000 more to the fund in 2011. She stated that, as the fund grows, the Committee might want to think about fully funding more applicants.

- Sherman pointed out that at the Technical Assistance meeting, he tells the attendees that most of the awards granted by the Committee tend to be around $5,000.

- Abbott suggested that it might encourage agencies to ask for funds for bigger projects, if just an illustrative range of grant awards were cited, rather than giving agencies a modal amount.

- Satterfield said that at the recent homelessness summit, participants agreed that agencies are not always good at cooperating with each other re: funding. Maybe the Committee might want to think about identifying one big need for the community and focusing its dollars on that need.

- Sandberg pointed out that some agencies are cooperative as some of them "sit out" of the Hopkins process on some years to give other agencies a greater opportunity.

- Abbott and Patterson said that the "sitting out" graciousness is true for the big players, but the smaller agencies cannot afford to do so. Funding is inherently competitive; there is no way around it.

- Abbott and Patterson pointed out that, while the Committee says that it encourages collaboration, it does not reward it.

- Abbott stated that she and Pete Giordano of Community and Family Relations could help the Committee define collaboration and could offer a program to prospective applicants on how collaboration works.

- Rhoads suggested that agencies might need substantial lead time to put together truly innovative and collaborative projects. This year, the Committee highlighted its prioritization of collaborative in its solicitation letter, but the letters were sent out only one month in advance of the due date

- Piedmont-Smith stated that she likes the idea of rewarding collaboration through bigger awards.

- Sandberg reminded the Committee that many agencies are serving the poor and there is only so much they can do to be innovative and collaborative. The focus of these agencies is on providing basic, emergency services.

- Mayer asked if the Committee might give out more, smaller-figure grants?

- Abbott said that Patterson is very busy. A $2,000 grant takes as much time to administer as a $20,000 grant.

- Satterfield asked Patterson what she would change about the current Hopkins program. Patterson responded that she would make bigger grants to make a bigger community impact. Smaller projects tend to have a smaller impact. Patterson stated that, to her mind, a greater community good would be realized if the Committee made bigger grants to fund bigger projects.

- Piedmont-Smith suggested that the Committee might want to meet in the fall to discuss further its emphasis on innovation and collaboration. Beginning in the fall would give agencies more advance notice and allow Pete and Lisa to offer guidance.

► The Committee agreed to meet in the fall of 2010. At that time, CDBG letters of intent would have been submitted.

III. SURVEY

The Committee reviewed the survey used last year and agreed to add a question asking applicants how they felt about electronic applications. Rhoads will work with City IT to come up with a question that solicits useful information. The survey will be distributed via "Survey Monkey."

IV. ESTABLISH 2010 NON-COUNCIL COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

A motion was made to maintain the status quo by asking the Community and Family Resources Commission to make one appointment and authorizing the Chair to appoint someone from a City social services entity.

V. MEETING *MEMORANDA*

The Committee must approve the following *Memoranda*:

- 23 February 2010 –Organizing Meeting
- 22 April 2010 –First Review of Applications
- 29 April 2010 – Agency Presentations
- 10 May 2010 – Pre-Allocation Meeting
- 17 May 2010 – Allocation Hearing
- 16 June 2010 – Debriefing Meeting

The Committee voted to delegate the final approval of *Memoranda* to the Chair, once other members have the opportunity to comment. The Committee will review and advise Chair Satterfield of any changes within the next week.

Piedmont-Smith pointed out that at the 22 April meeting, she thought the vote to eliminate that IU Trustees vote was unanimous, but notes reflect the vote was 5-1. Rhoads said she will go back and listen to the audio.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned at 6:47 p.m.